

**Draft Summary of the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)  
May 15, 2001**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group on May 15, 2001 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary of the discussion for information purposes for interested parties who could not attend the meeting.

**Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees with their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

**Action Items – April 10, 2001 Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting**

A summary of the April 10, 2001 Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from the April 10, 2001 meeting as follows:

**Action Item #LU4:** Andy Atkinson will investigate California Department of Fish and Game action relative to Riverbend Park activity.  
Status: Fish and Game had stopped work at Riverbend Park pending resolution of permit issues between the Fish and Game and the Feather River Recreation and Parks District. The issue was resolved quickly and after a brief delay work at the park resumed.

**Action Item #LU5:** Consultant Team will revise issue statements (including specific issue annotations) per comments and distribute to Work Group before next meeting.  
Status: A review of the revised issue statements is part of this agenda.

Jim Martin from DWR updated the Work Group on an issue raised by Craig Jones of the State Water Contractors regarding the make-up of the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group. Craig had stated that land use issues cross the boundaries of the other Work Groups and the integrated expertise needed to address these issues would require official representation from the other Work Groups. SWC wanted to consider the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group a super Task Force of the Plenary Group with a more formal structure. Jim reported that DWR staff met with Craig and they discussed the procedures and approach of the Work Group. Craig confirmed his support for the direction and progress that the group was making and rescinded his request.

**Carryover Action Item from the March 13, 2001 Meeting**

**Action Item #LU2:** Provide DWR/DPR relationship document (Administrative Order #6) to the public resource depository.  
Status: A copy of Administrative Order #6 is in the public resource repository.

## **Review of Issue Statement Revisions**

At the last Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting, the consulting team was tasked with revising Issue Statements based on Work Group input from their last meeting. The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group received a copy of the revised Issue Statements and the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Master Issues list. Each Issue Statement includes a reference to the original issue developed during previous Work Group, Plenary Group and public meetings. The revised Issue Statements and Master Issue list are appended to this summary as Attachments 4 and 5, respectively.

- ♦ The Work Group discussed the formatting of each Issue Statement, and the inconsistency in presentation of Issue Statements between the Work Groups. Some Statements are posed as questions; others start with the word "Evaluate". Several Work Group members mentioned that some of the Issue Statements might be better characterized as resource goals. The group agreed that the terminology associated with the Issue Sheets and Scoping Document needs to be clear and used by each Work Group consistently. The Work Group requested definitions of commonly used terms.
- ♦ The Work Group discussed the need to provide a uniform definition for the term "project lands" for the scoping document. The group recognized that for each Issue Statement, the Geographic Scope of project lands would be defined on the Issue Sheet. However, in the Scoping Document, the Geographic Scope section would not be available. The Work Group agreed to initiate a task force and delegate the responsibility to develop a definition of the term 'project lands' that would exclusively accompany the Land Use, Land Management, and Aesthetics Work Group Issue Statements to the Plenary Group for inclusion in the Scoping Document. Task force members are: Ward Tabor, Dave Ferguson, Craig Jones, Ron Davis, Steve Nachtman, and Jim Martin. The Work Group agreed that the task force recommendation would go directly to the Plenary Group with the revised Issue Statements.
- ♦ Craig Jones offered an additional Land Management Issue Statement for consideration by the Work Group. The Work Group revised LU1 to cover Craig's concern and eliminate the need for an additional Land Management Issue Statement.
- ♦ Craig Jones reported that at the recent Lake Oroville JPA meeting, Mayor Andoe had mentioned a new issue that should be added to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Master Issues list. The Mayor asked that where applicable, State held properties could be sold to the public for potential commercial or private development. The Work Group agreed that the issue should be added to the Master Issues list and, pending confirmation from Mayor Andoe, Issue Statement LU2 covers the issue.

The Work Group discussed each Issue Statement and agreed to forward the issue statements as recommendations to the Plenary Group for inclusion in Scoping Document 1, pending the following revisions:

### **LAND USE**

- LU1: What are the appropriate, compatible, and potential developmental and non-developmental uses of project lands especially for public use, public access, open-space, recreational uses, watershed and natural resources protection/management, energy resources and cultural values in a way that integrates and respects: 1) resource constraints; 2) adjacent land uses; and 3) applicable plans (including the Forest Service, State, County, and City of Oroville land planning and zoning) and policies for project lands and adjacent lands? (Issues Addressed: Land Use 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8)
- LU2: What is the potential for acquiring or removing project lands (including other property interests) to meet resource goals? (Issues addressed: Land Use 4, 5, 9)

## **LAND MANAGEMENT**

- LM1: What are the funding and staffing needs to adequately address land management for the Oroville Wildlife Area, Lake Oroville State Recreation Area (LOSRA), Thermalito Afterbay, and other project lands? (Issues addressed: Land Management 1,4,5,16)
- LM2: What are the existing and future fuel loads, fuel management practices, and coordination of fuel management activities for lands located within and adjacent to the project boundary to manage the risk of loss of property, lives, and natural resources? (Issues addressed: Land Management 6, 7, 10, 14).
- LM3: What is an appropriate arrangement for land management of recreation facilities of LOSRA, Thermalito Afterbay, Wildlife area and other project lands? (Issues addressed: Land Management 8)
- LM4: What are appropriate law enforcement activities, security and penalties for project lands? (Issues addressed: Land Management 1, 4, 5, 15, 16).

## **AESTHETICS**

- A1: What are the effects of reservoir drawdown on the visual quality at Lake Oroville and other project lands? (Issues addressed: Aesthetics 6, 16)
- A2: What are the effects of construction debris, garbage, and invasive species on the appearance of project lands? (Issues Addressed: Aesthetics 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 15).
- A3: What are the appropriate landscaping, restoration, preservation, vegetation and facilities management/maintenance programs for aesthetic enhancement of project lands? (Issues addressed: Aesthetics 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16)
- A4: What are the effects of existing and future project features (including transmission lines, trails, etc) and land uses on the aesthetic quality of project lands? (Issues addressed: Aesthetics 7, 8, 9, 10, 16).

### **Next Steps in the Process – Graphic**

In response to a request made during the last Plenary Group meeting, the Consultant Team was tasked with preparing a graphic showing the scoping and study plan development process, and the status of current Work Group activities. The intent of the graphic is to show Work Group members how the development of Issue Statements fit into the development of these two documents, and how these activities will eventually lead to a license application. The facilitator shared a draft graphic, representing the current Work Group efforts and expected end products and asked for the Work Group's response.

- ♦ The Work Group discussed how the Issue Statements serve the dual purpose of providing the foundation for the NEPA Scoping Document and the development of study plans. The purpose of developing the Issue Statements is to get all the issues identified for the NEPA process and provide the range of study issues for the study plans.
- ♦ Craig Jones of the State Water Contractors commented that the graphic helped clarify the relationship between the issue and scoping statements, and the scoping and study plan processes. He added that the message probably needed to be clarified to the other Work Groups as well.
- ♦ One participant added that further clarification of terminology, and using uniform terminology in all the Work Groups would be useful as well.

- ♦ One participant asked for a copy of the graphic and the facilitator explained it was still draft and not ready for distribution but she would welcome any comments on it from the participants.

### **Issue Sheet Development**

Draft Issue Sheets with Issue Statements, straw man Resource Goals and suggested Geographic Scope were distributed to the Work Group and are provided as Attachment 6. The Work Group was tasked with reviewing this information for discussion and revision at their next meeting. The facilitator agreed to revised the handout to reflect the changes made to the Issue Statements at tonight's meeting and send out new versions of the handout by Friday.

- ♦ Craig Jones mentioned that it would be useful to have the issues related to each resource goal more clearly stated rather than having an index number to the master issue list. The group agreed that the issue sheets should include a bulleted list of the issues from the Master Issue list, attached either directly below or above the Resource Goals.

### **Next Meeting**

The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group agreed to meet on:

Date: Tuesday, June 12, 2001  
 Time: 6:00 to 10 PM  
 Location: To be determined

The Work Group discussed the possibility of CDF presenting information on fuel loading issues at the next meeting and agreed to schedule a presentation and add it to the June Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group agenda.

### **Agreements Made**

1. The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group agreed to approve the revised Issues Statements, and forward them to the Plenary Group for inclusion in Scoping Document 1.
2. The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group identified a task force and delegated the task of developing a definition for "project lands" as used in the Issue Statements. The Task Force recommendation will accompany this work group's revised Issues Statements sent to the Plenary Group.
3. The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group agreed to review draft issue sheets, geographic scopes, and resource goals and discuss them at their next meeting.
4. The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group agreed to meet again on June 12, 2001 from 6:00 PM to 10:00 PM (location to be determined).

### **Action Items**

The following list of action items identified by the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

**Action Item #LU6:** Provide definitions of Issue Sheet and other commonly used terms and examples to the Work Group.

**Responsible:** Consulting Team

**Due Date:** June 12, 2001

**Action Item #LU7:** Develop definition for 'project land' to accompany the Land Use, Land Management, and Aesthetics Work Group Issue Statement submittal to Plenary Group for inclusion in Scoping Document I.

**Responsible:** Task Force

**Due Date:** June 12, 2001

**Action Item #LU8:** Investigate development of a project map that shows land ownership and land use designations for project and nearby lands.

**Responsible:** DWR Staff

**Due Date:** June 12, 2001

**Action Item #LU9:** Provide the Work Group with the Process Graphic

**Responsible:** Consulting Team

**Due Date:** June 12, 2001

**Action Item #LU10:** Make inquiry of the Department of Forestry and the U.S. Forest Service regarding a presentation on fuel load issues at the next Work Group meeting.

**Responsible:** Consulting Team

**Due Date:** June 12, 2001

**Action Item #LU11:** Confirm with Mayor Andoe text for his issue regarding sale of some project lands.

**Responsible:** Facilitator

**Due Date:** June 12, 2001

**Action Item #LU12:** Provide revised handouts of Draft Issue Sheets, reflecting changes made to the Issue Statements.

**Responsible:** Facilitator

**Due Date:** May 18, 2001